

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments set forth above and the below remarks.

Claims 1-10, 14-33, 35-43, 45-61, and 67-78 are pending in the application: claims 25, 36, 49, 73, 76, and 78 are objected to, and claims 1-10, 14-24, 26-33, 35, 37-48, 50-61, 67-72, 74, 75, and 77 are rejected. Claims 22 and 50-61 and 67-78 are herein canceled without prejudice. Claims 62-66 were previously canceled without prejudice.

The Claim Objections Under §112

The Examiner rejects claims 54 and 70 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. These claims are herein cancelled without prejudice.

The Prior Art Rejections

The Examiner makes claim rejections over primary references U.S. Patent No. 4,451, 804 to Viesz and/or "A 'Zero' Ripple Technique Applicable to Any DC Converter," by Hamill, as set forth in detail on pages 3-22 of the Office Action mailed on October 28, 2004.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the great courtesy extended to the undersigned and to inventor David Perreault during a telephone interview on December 14, 2004. It is believed that the interview was worthwhile and productive in addressing the Examiner's concerns with regard to resonant circuits reading on the invention and in giving the inventor an opportunity to clarify the invention in view of the cited references. During the interview, the Viesz and Hamill references were discussed. It was agreed that incorporating the subject matter of claim 22 into claim 1 and further adding language to specify that the voltage on the capacitor is not canceled distinguished the invention over circuits that resonate, as described by Viesz and Hamill. It was discussed that at resonance, circuits generate a sum of zero for three voltages, namely, voltage due to the coupled windings, voltage due to the equivalent series inductance, and voltage due to

the capacitance of the capacitor. By requiring that the voltage due to the capacitance of the capacitor not be canceled, amended claim 1 distinguishes over resonant circuits.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that claim 1 as amended is patentably distinguishable over the cited references. For at least the same reasons, Applicant submits that claims depending from claim 1 are also distinguishable.

Independent claims 27 and 38 are amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant believes that these claims and claims depending from these claims are patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1.

Claims 50-61 and 67-78 are herein canceled without prejudice and claims 62-66 were previously canceled without prejudice.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that claims 1-10, 14-21, 23-33, 35-43, and 45-49 are in condition for allowance and a notice thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

Applicant does not acquiesce to any assertion made by the Examiner not specifically addressed herein. In addition, the amendments contained herein, including claim cancellations, are made to expedite allowance of the case and Applicant reserves the right to pursue the originally-filed and other claims in continuation applications without prejudice.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Dated: 21 Jan 05

Respectfully submitted,

DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP

By: 

Paul D. Durkee
Reg. No. 41,003
Attorney for Applicant(s)
275 Turnpike Street, Suite 101
Canton, MA 02021-2354
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, x21
Fax: (781) 401-9966
pdd@dc-m.com

\\server01\client_files\Prolaw documents\MIT-106PUS\4965.doc